



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ART. VII. — *The Puritan Commonwealth. An Historical Review of the Puritan Government in Massachusetts, in its Civil and Ecclesiastical Relations from its Rise to the Abrogation of the First Charter. Together with some General Reflections on the English Colonial Policy, and on the Character of Puritanism.* By the late PETER OLIVER, of the Suffolk Bar. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1856. 8vo. pp. 502.

THIS book is designed to tell "the other side of the story" of the fathers of Massachusetts. It contains an unfavorable, an unfriendly, an excessively severe disquisition upon their policy. It subjects to a most unsparing freedom of criticism their motives, principles, and conduct, as well as all their peculiar institutions in church and state. Heretofore we have been accustomed to listen to the favorable, the laudatory side of their story. With the exception of an occasional apologetic essay or discourse, designed to soften or nullify some especial assault or criticism, we have been wont to read only confident boasts and high eulogiums of all that our fathers planned or perfected. Bancroft, idealizing his theme with the splendors of a rich and glowing fancy, and setting it forth in the most captivating rhetoric, is held by all competent judges as having overwrought his work. His brilliancy, erudition, and fervor of style, while they captivate the reader, are not always made tributary to the sober and homely truth of his subject. A double anachronism runs through his pages. He has ascribed to the Puritans a philosophical theory of democracy of which they never dreamed, and he has assumed for that theory a vitality, a maturity of development, and an honored acceptance two hundred years ago, such as it can hardly be said to have secured for itself until quite recently, as the result of modern thought and conflict. Grahame threw the whole sympathy of his creed and heart into his History. His pleadings are often too strong; his assertions are very frequently too positive and unqualified; his zeal occasionally is unwisely spent; and, whether it be to its praise or its reproach, we must say that his History has no philosophy. Hildreth is an exception in spirit and method to our histo-

rians. Utterly destitute of sympathy with the Puritans, he is also too well read in their annals, and too honest to his own sense of right, to allow his fancy to transfigure them or any of their doings. In his treatment of them he is cold, rather than calm; contemptuous and cynical, rather than appreciative or judicial.

It is not, however, in our formal and elaborate histories that we find the materials for our prevailing views and the reiteration of the glory of our Puritan fathers. Our Plymouth Rock and Fourth of July orations, our town and church centennials, and our New England festivals, now observed in the chief cities of the land, draw forth every year so many utterances, that those who do not read history are kept in constant remembrance of the renown of their ancestors. It would be strange if the mythical element which has confounded the annals of mercurial Rome, as well as the finer traditions of Greece, had not passed at least into the rhetoric of our frequent declaimers. We will not say that they have exhausted their subject; for rather have they invented, or enriched and intensified, their subject, — the stock and staple of their discourse, — which is the praise of the Puritans. The matter has been carried so far as to become a grievance. All men of sense acknowledge this, nor will any bugbear reproach of ingratitude, or of inability to appreciate stern virtues and rigid principles, avail for the future to repress the utterance of disgust at this over-doing of a theme the glory of which is human and imperfect. It may be well that this blatant rhetoric, this stilted exaggeration, should be checked before it has really made the theme itself ridiculous; for some of us have already begun to ridicule our own excesses, and it is not to be marvelled at, if, while friends are ashamed, enemies and scoffers should triumph. The extravagant praise which has been so lavishly bestowed on the Puritans, as holding opinions and advancing principles utterly inconsistent with their most cherished convictions as well as with their limitations of view and their prejudices, has provoked rebuke. Patience has been exhausted, and hostility, which was never subdued, has been roused to some bold manifestations. This hostility, however, is too boastful; it is overshooting its mark, and will feel the

recoil of its own weapons. But it is no wonder that some, even among the descendants of the Puritans, are asking if there is not another side to the story usually told of them.

In one very important respect the festivities of the ball and the dance connected with recent celebrations of Forefathers' Day at Plymouth, are not more inconsistent with the practices of the Puritans, than was an assertion made there by Senator Seward in his Oration, with their principles. We refer to his assertion, that they were thoroughly loyal to the great principles of religious liberty, and that "they had adopted one true, singular, and sublime principle of civil conduct, namely, that the subject in every state has a natural right to religious liberty of conscience." Now it would be difficult to define the exact limitations which the Plymouth fathers put upon the lawful exercise of this liberty; but it is positively certain that they did not honor nor allow its legitimate workings. The mischief has been chiefly in the exaggeration and in the transformation by modern lights of certain facts, which fidelity to the truth of Puritan history must present in a manner quite different from that in which they are related in our demonstrative orations. Another manifest error is that of ascribing to the principles of the Puritans the honor of some noble results from the workings of those principles. Some of these results the Puritans did not recognize, nor aim after; others of them they would have dreaded and withstood if proposed to them. These results from the workings of Puritan principles may even have been wrought out in actual collision with the principles themselves, and in deadliest opposition to them, while nevertheless they may be honestly assumed as the fruits from a Puritan tillage. There was a Puritan spirit, as well as a Puritan commonwealth. That spirit raised some other spirits, which it could not conjure back into the deep. Besides the recognized motives and objects which the exiles pursued, we must make allowance for the impulse which had taken possession of them, and was driving them they knew not whither. They were themselves the subjects of an inspiration, as well as the obedient servants of the truth which the world had then reached. Irresistibly, and in spite of their convictions and prejudices, they wrought out the results in

which we glory. Their eulogists must be careful to draw these distinctions; for there are those who will tell the other side of the story, if they do not tell their own side candidly.

Now Mr. Oliver's book designs, as we have said, to tell "the other side of the story" touching the Massachusetts fathers, who, with some especial liabilities of their own, must share all the reproach that can be visited on their Plymouth brethren. We trust that in what we have thus far written we have sufficiently assured our readers that we are not going to be angry with Mr. Oliver, while we attempt to deal with him. We have discharged ourselves of all indignation of a wicked or malignant character, by admitting to ourselves that he is right in matters which do not tell against anything that we care to defend, while we are calmly sure that he is wrong, clearly and demonstrably wrong, where we should be at issue with him. We have been well aware for some years that such a book as his could be written. We knew that there were facts enough for its basis; that there was a spirit abroad which could deal with these facts, and array them, and argue from them as he has done; and that they admitted of just that coloring and setting which he has given them, as helping, with the aid of false lights, misconstructions, and strong antagonistic prejudices, to tell the other side of a story told too often recklessly, fancifully, and in a manner to provoke indignant criticism and ridicule. We have therefore been expecting such a book as this before us. But we did not look for it in the quarter from which it has come. We had not supposed that a descendant of the Puritans was to be the author of it. There is an old Scripture story of the filial piety of two sons, who, throwing a mantle over their own shoulders, walked backward to cover with it the nakedness and shame of their father. There is also an old proverb as to the sort of bird which defiles its own nest. But we will not press the moral of Scripture or proverb. Perhaps we should rather commend the candor and magnanimity of one, who, with a Puritan lineage which identifies him with the very foremost of those whose fair fame he questions, could divest himself of the affection which covers, that he might exercise the severity which exposes, errors. Our author also says that we must be tolerant.

And we must be so. We are daily practising, we feel that we are daily advancing in, that hard virtue. Mr. Oliver has aided our own efforts for its attainment in both the ways in which we learn it from others, — by their practice and by their neglect of it. A descendant of the Puritans, who is their champion only in so far as he resolves that they shall have fair play, is sure of his ground. Bitterness or abuse in dealing with their assailants, especially with so serene and gentlemanly a one as Mr. Oliver, will not help us. Life, social, literary, and religious, is presenting to us on all sides tokens of the instability and the easy revulsion of feelings and judgments. There are daily conversions to and from all the old parties and all the new parties about everything. When the late excellent Dr. Wainwright, of New York, gratified his own feelings by gathering up the copies of the fine engraving of his eminent grandfather, Jonathan Mayhew, the liberal-minded and patriotic-souled minister of Boston, he saw the broken crosier and the dishonored mitre, the very emblems of his own episcopal dignity, turned into the trophies of his grandsire's victory over prelacy and despotic power. The Bishop never repudiated his Christian name, and we can believe that he recognized the nobility of soul which made it honorable, though he could help to undo the work from which it received its fame. There is a nobler loyalty, too, than that to ancestry. We can afford to hear *the truth* about *our* ancestry, seeing that the only claim which they made upon us is that we should judge them, not by their attainments in it, but by their sacrifices for it, and their fidelity to their own views of it. Every word that is to condemn them comes from their own pens. How would Mr. Oliver have learned his tactics except through their magnanimous self-exposure?

The author of this book is not among the living to read or to answer what we may write about him or it. But we will write nothing about him or his book which in temper or in assertion we should be unwilling to defend at the only tribunal where we can expect to meet him. The work, left in manuscript by the deceased author, was edited for publication, with evident pains and devotion, by a brother. We must say a few words touching the family history. Perhaps

our readers may find in the genealogy of the author, which presents one painful interruption in its course to the transmission of the spirit with the lineage of a Massachusetts Puritan, an explanation of the backward cast of the writer's heart and love, at least in one direction.

Thomas Oliver, as Winthrop tells us, was "ordained by imposition of hands," as the first ruling elder of the First Church of Boston, in 1632. He was a Puritan among Puritans, and would doubtless have held high civil offices save for the feeling which forbade the union of secular and sacred functions. From this honored man descended a line of honored and useful and thriving men, for the service of church and state, till the troubled times of the Revolution embittered the feelings of former friends. The elder, with many of the foremost members of his church, sided for a while with Mrs. Hutchinson in her dismal controversy, and he appears on the list of those "ordered to bee disarmed." It would seem, however, from the famous Captain Keayne's manuscript, in the archives of our Historical Society, that his son, John, was soon after sent in behalf of the church to confer and remonstrate with Mrs. Hutchinson and her exiled friends in Rhode Island.

Andrew Oliver, a great-grandson of the elder, was Secretary of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, when, in 1771, he became successor to his brother-in-law, Mr. Hutchinson, as Lieutenant-Governor. He willingly accepted the odious office of Stamp-Distributor, when the tyrannical act which made the office necessary was passed by the British Parliament. The popular indignation, which led to sharp insults and to the mobbing of his dwelling, compelled him to resign that trust, and the people petitioned the king that he might be removed from his higher office. He was brother to the Chief Justice of the Province, who, equally honored before, was equally hated after, he received the dignities and emoluments purchased by disloyalty to "liberty." The Lieutenant-Governor "was then," says Dr. Eliot, "in very ill health, and soon after descended to the grave with all his imperfections upon his head," in March, 1774. Our author was the great-great-grandson of this unhappy gentleman, through a lineage highly distinguished in literary, legal, clerical, and medical offices and

services. Whether the strong monarchical predilections which Mr. Oliver displays in this volume are to be accounted to any warping of sympathy for a cause in which an ancestor suffered severely while looking for profit and power, our readers can judge for themselves. As to the other proclivity of our author, more amazing still in the descendant of such a lineage, — a proclivity which exhibits itself in an admiration of High-Church principles to a degree reaching, as we shall see, to fanaticism, — it is no business of ours in these pages to propound an explanation or to institute criticism.

The book appears in the most elegant and attractive form in which type-founders, paper-makers, and printers have learned to present their joint skill and taste. It is issued by our most distinguished publishing firm, who have poured over our community a stream of good literature. Strange to say, we have seen in a newspaper criticism of the work a censorious reflection cast upon the publishers for being instrumental in the circulation of a volume the contents of which are so wounding to our ancestral and local pride. This is but a poor stroke, where manly blows and searching criticism may find such abounding material for their exercise. The book is written in a style of unsurpassed beauty. It has every grace of facile and attractive composition. Uniformly correct and chaste in diction, pointed and terse in its emphatic passages, exact and chastened in its rhetoric, it occasionally presents sentences and paragraphs in which the cast of the language and the fitness of the imagery compel our admiration. In defining the spirit, the *animus* of the work, we must remember our own pledge, of keeping a good temper. We do not forget the pledge when we affirm that the spirit of the book is a very bad one, — almost as bad as can possess a man who is writing of the motives and deeds of those whose sincerity of purpose and whose sufferings for a cause which they esteemed the holiest ought at least to soften the censure visited upon their delusions, their prejudices, and their errors. Pages of this book we have read with utter amazement; other pages have afforded us almost unqualified amusement. We have been confounded at noticing the heterogeneous elements which enter into the author's standard and principles

of criticism for judging men and times two centuries ago. His diseases of fancy mark him almost as a monomaniac. When he most widely wanders from the path of fair truth and charity, it is by losing himself in a cloud of his own raising. He does deal largely in facts ; there is no denying that he has a basis of good, substantial evidence for very many of his assertions. His inferences and arguments, too, are often perfectly unassailable. It would be idle for any one to attempt to answer him in detail. Often it must be only by an admission of the truth of his statements, and of the deductions which he draws from them, followed by the suggestion of other and larger facts which override them, that he can be dealt with to any good purpose. Should his work provoke much hostile criticism, or many rejoinders, the risk will be, either that the critics will fall short of, or will outrun, their mark. The Puritans cannot be defended by a simple answer to his specific charges against them. Most unwisely would a champion of theirs consent to argue their cause within the terms which Mr. Oliver defines for their trial. The ideas which filled their thoughts and quickened their activity are obsolete. They have left descendants, but no inheritors of their policy. Their generation was cut off. For the most part, those who rail at them, and those who patronize and extol them in fustian orations, would have fared equally hard in personal converse with them, or under their spiritual or civil dominancy.

Mr. Oliver utterly misconstrues the Puritans, from the beginning to the end of his elaborate and most richly-wrought essay. He starts with a bias which perverts his judgment. With an inconsistency that is amusing where it is not amazing, he confounds principles and sentiments which mark separated centuries of time and express reconciled feelings where once there was the sharpest hostility. He transfers to the angry strifes of the seventeenth century the humane and generous views of the nineteenth century. The wise tolerance which is the growth and flower of all the hard husbandry that matured it from the dread conflicts of many ages, is turned by him into a condemnation of the very men who both suffered the most in their own persons through the intolerance of others, and were the providential instruments for proving, through their

conscientious fidelity to a wrong principle, that it is wrong, forbidden, and accursed. Nor is this all. Our author, who applies to the Puritans a standard far in advance of their own times, goes back to another class of men in those times to find a standard of judgment for himself. He is under the bewitching spell of an antiquated and now ideal fancy, which charms him with loyalty to an anointed sovereign as head of state and church, and with an admiration for prelacy and hierarchical sway. He subordinates the Bible to the ecclesiastical system which confessedly grew up outside of its influence, and in defiance of the liberty of soul of which it is the Magna Charta. We have read many of the pages of the Puseyite school, but in none of them have we found so much of the fond weakness which is captivated by the romance of idealized and obsolete fancies, as in those of Mr. Oliver's book. The gray hue which softens, and the ivy which beautifies, the old crumbling battlements of tyranny, win him from the manlier delight of rejoicing over their ruins. It is beyond measure marvellous to find a man of a New England stock and training thus bowing in adoration before the dishonored shrines of ancient pagods. It is but another illustration of the cunning skill of fancy in idealizing and transfiguring old delusions. Scattered over the pages of this volume are sentences which the sycophantic drivellers about the divine right of anointed kings would have been glad to quote, if they had had the opportunity, two hundred years ago. Cromwell, beyond comparison the wisest and most patriotic sovereign that ever ruled England, the most of a man, ay, and the most of a saint, among all her monarchs, is characterized by Mr. Oliver as "that hero of hypocrisy and treason, defying God and man." The "royal martyr," Charles, is presented as a paragon of all the virtues, though our author could hardly have failed in his wide reading to meet with the pithy questions of our own Mayhew, touching the claim of saintship for the king, — "Is there any such thing as grace without goodness? Or as saintship without sanctity?" The noble Russell bears in these pages the scornful epithet of "traitor." Even William of Orange is called a "usurper." Mr. Oliver enlarges upon the mischief wrought by the circulation of the

Scriptures, in the spirit of one who should rail at the showers from heaven, as they fall upon "the just and the unjust," because a freshet sometimes works mischief. The English patriots who were withstanding the tyranny of Charles, are stigmatized as a "miserable rabble." More truly did Mayhew again say of that earthly monarch, "that he acted in defiance of laws which the Almighty King regards, — the eternal laws of truth, wisdom, and equity."

We must now present in a summary way the specific accusations which Mr. Oliver brings against the fathers of Massachusetts. We will state them rather within, than in any way beyond, the terms of severity in which he repeatedly announces them. We must premise that he claims credit for courage, candor, high service to the cause of sacred truth, and for painstaking research and judicial fairness, in his thankless task of questioning the fair fame of the dead. He alleges that the Puritans of Massachusetts practised a most deceitful game of overreaching and hypocrisy in securing their Charter from Charles I.; that the patent which in his royal benignity and piety he graciously bestowed, with the intent of furthering a Christian missionary design under the auspices of the Church of England, was grossly perverted, first, to a worldly end of gain, and then to wicked ends of sedition, conspiracy, treason, and schism; that the Puritans sneakingly stole away from England, surreptitiously transferring hither a Charter which had been intended solely as an instrument for a corporation resident at home, and that they used it here as the basis of a constitution of government, — a disloyal and illegal government, — thus perverting it from its purpose, thwarting its provisions, and forfeiting its privileges; that when they had established themselves here under a Charter never designed for such a use, and utterly unsuited to serve the necessities of the legislative, judicial, and executive offices of government, they were compelled to do all manner of violence to it, claiming immunity from it, and yet trifling with it, straining it, and supplementing it at their pleasure; that this violation of their Charter involved the most outrageous oppression of their fellow-exiles in property, happiness, and civil and religious rights, brought in an arbitrary rule, high-handed

tyranny, and cruelty, even to the length of maiming and capital punishment; that, instead of devoting themselves to the work of Christianizing the Indians, they demoralized and exterminated them, after receiving benefits inflicting injuries, being heartless, pitiless, and extortionate towards them, forming treaties with them by guile, and violating these treaties without scruple, visiting upon them the curses of civilization, scorning them as children of the Devil, and slaughtering them with the boast that they were serving God and his saints, the saints being themselves; that for half a century they kept up an artful, evasive, and wicked strife of intrigue, duplicity, and falsehood with the King and his Council, or with Parliament, to retain their Charter when summoned to surrender it, to defend themselves against just charges brought against them at the throne by those whom they had wronged, and to secure their ill-gotten power; that though the unsettled state of affairs in England, where rebellion and disorder kindred to that of the Puritan Commonwealth prevailed, enabled them to protract the issue, the first establishment of authority there compelled them to surrender their Charter, while the fruits of their fraudulent legislation visited long and bitter penalties upon themselves and their posterity; and, finally, that the principles of the Puritan Commonwealth were absurd and self-destructive, hostile to true liberty and pure religion, as was made evident by their trial, which resulted in multiplying all forms of heresy and rebellion, in fostering the most fierce and malignant spirit of intolerance, and in covering Puritanism with discomfiture and reproach, to yield place to a better system — which it is to be observed our author does not define — that shall rise upon its ruins.

Here certainly is a most formidable array of counts in a most comprehensive indictment. Those who are well read in our history have doubtless admitted to themselves the element of fact which may be worked into the support of these sweeping charges. There is either a semblance or a substance of truth in a part of them, and much as our author has made of the facts upon which he wrought, we are willing to grant that he might have made even more of them. The elders and magistrates are the prime offenders in his view, and of course

he traces the instigation and the chief agency of all this wickedness to the ministers.

He has made a most diligent and exhaustive use of the original sources of information on all matters pertaining to our history. A world of labor must he have spent in his task. We commend his diligence; we will endeavor to think highly of his motives; we are sure that at least some of the results of his work will be of signal service to the truth. It may be asked whether he has cited and quoted his authorities fairly. We may answer, in general, that he has, under the abatement, however, of this marked qualification, — that he might have found passages in the writings which he has quoted, the tenor of which is directly inconsistent in spirit or assertion with those he has cited, or with the uses for which he employs them. It will be well for a careful reader to test and follow his citations; for our own experience has satisfied us that the results will repay the labor. Mr. Oliver has a way of quoting a part when the whole would not serve him. He is also apt to add glosses of his own. Thus, in his sketch of the measures and dealings of the Puritans with the Indians, he quotes from Governor Winthrop the assertion, that the Pequods, who had been so fearfully exterminated, "had done Massachusetts no injury." But the Governor says also that his Colony had engaged in that war "in point of conscience, on others' behalfe," from motives of humanity, as of necessity, with trust in Providence, and without counting the cost of risk and injury to themselves. Again, Mr. Oliver says that friends at court wrote to the Puritans here when their Charter was in peril, "that it would be unsafe to attract notice by neglecting the prayers for the King, *or differing widely from the ritual of the Church of England.*" For the part of this quotation which we have italicized, Mr. Oliver was indebted to his imagination. The letter which he cites, reads: "And I desire that you differ no more from us in church government, than you shall find that we differ from the prescript rule of God's word, and further I meddle not." He repeats from D'Israeli the silly and apocryphal story of the Independents having bribed "one Field, who printed the Pearl Bibles," to corrupt the text in Acts vi. 3. He says that, "had Puritanism

been certain of a Divine mission," it would never have recorded such an incident as that related by Governor Winthrop, of a mouse having gnawed the leaves of the Common Prayer and spared the Psalms and Greek Testament bound up with it. Now the good Governor tells the story as an *evidence* of this very "Divine mission of Puritanism."

Not without profit to ourselves have we devoted many hours to the perusal of the elaborate and beautifully written pages of this work. We confess that we have derived from its spirit and method a very vivid idea of what our ancestors signified by the term "malignant," as applied to an enemy of theirs. We think, however, that we have a tolerably just conception of what we are bound to plead and suggest in their vindication against Mr. Oliver. We are no unqualified admirers of the Puritans. We could not have lived with them. Our words for them might have been little, if any, less tolerable with them, than Mr. Oliver's against them. But we shall essay something on their side.

In dealing, so far as our space will permit, with the more prominent and emphatic charges adduced by Mr. Oliver in condemnation of the planters of the Bay Colony, we must begin, as he does, with the matter of the Charter. It is necessary to his purpose that he should warp some facts, and misstate others, at the very start. The first sentences of his book advance the fundamental assumption on which all its argument on his main point proceeds, and that assumption is a figment of his own brain. He refers the Charter of Massachusetts to a suggestion originating in the mind of Charles I., and prompted by his royal zeal in the cause of Christian missions. The adventurers obtained their Charter by pretending an interest in that missionary enterprise. So far, then, as they made trade or any secular object paramount to the work of spreading the Gospel among the Indians, they were guilty of a breach of contract, of a perversion of a kingly favor. If the weight of censure justly to be visited on them upon this score would condemn the fathers of Massachusetts, how much more then do they deserve reproach for having abused the King's favor so outrageously in making their Charter the constitution of a disloyal and schismatical commonwealth!

Thus Mr. Oliver says, "The franchise was mercantile in character, but missionary in design." When the patentees decided to transfer the Charter and the government of their Company under it to these shores, our author expresses intense indignation that in "this fraud upon the King and the Church" the spirit of trade should have triumphed over a Gospel work. It was "to rob the Indians" of a blessing intended for them by Charles. When the fleet of exiles started on the voyage, he says that they "departed with all the stealth of guilt from the kingdom, bearing with them a franchise which belonged to the Church." This marvellous assumption runs through and perverts all Mr. Oliver's argument. The monarch is said by him to have beheld "with the favor of a truly catholic mind the project that was then forming in the English Church to extend her borders over his dominions in the West," and "he willingly added the weight of his prerogative to an enterprise which, it seemed, must draw down a benediction from Heaven." This is pure fiction. Not a jot of evidence is there that King or Church was then intent upon any missionary project, or had any inceptive interest in a design which from first to last began, and was confined, within the motives of the patentees themselves.* Not with the King nor with the Church were the first negotiations transacted. The royal approval was but the formal recognition of a bargain made between other parties. By what right could the monarch have looked to a company of merchant adventurers, at their own charges, and without motion or help from a single church dignitary, to undertake a work, which in instigation at least, if not in its cost and conduct, belonged to the established authorities in things spiritual? There is an absurdity at the very bottom of this plea. The victims of an oppressive and odious hierarchy from whose despotism they wished to escape are represented by our author as drawn into a project for transplanting it into the New World by the zeal of a distrusted King! It is difficult to believe that prejudice and an intense hatred of Puri-

* The Rev. Joseph Kingsmill, a minister, and an historian of the Missions of the English Church, in his work on the subject (p. 249), says: "To the usurper, Cromwell, belongs the credit of having first planned a mission from the Reformed Churches to the less favored parts of the world."

tanism did not help Mr. Oliver to the exaggeration of the only, the very slender grounds on which he bases his plea. There are two sentences in the Charter cast in the style of a formal piety in their phraseology. Had he run through any collection of charters and patents, beginning with the Bull of Donation of Pope Alexander VI., in 1493, investing Ferdinand and Isabella with the title to these western regions, he would have put a more moderate construction on these formulas of piety. The first two Virginia Charters are large and ardent in the use of such language, and a precious fulfilment did it meet in the first English doings there! The Massachusetts Charter was derived from the original patent of the Council of Plymouth. How far that patent provided for a missionary work among our Indians may be inferred from the fact that one reason alleged for bestowing upon Englishmen a title to these regions was the following: "That within these late yeares there hath by God's visitation raigned a wonderfull Plague, together with many horrible slaughters and murthers, committed amongst the Savages and brutish people there heertofore inhabiting, in a manner to the utter destruction, devastacion, and depopulacion of that whole Territorie, so that there is not left for many leagues together, in a manner, any that doe claime or challenge any kind of interest therein." Thankfulness is then expressed, that the "Divine Majestie" has laid these regions open to Englishmen. "We may with boldness goe on to the settling of soe hopefull a work, which tendeth to the reducing and conversion of such Savages as remaine wandering in desolacion and distresse to civil societie and Christian religion, to the enlargement of our own dominions, and the advancement of the fortunes of such of our good subjects as shall willingly intresse themselves in the said imployment." It needs Mr. Oliver's admiration of royal religious zeal to find a missionary project here. We have no doubt that the Massachusetts adventurers had and avowed a missionary purpose. But it was one of their own conception, not suggested to them by the King or the Church, and, as we shall see, it was one of a very peculiar character.

In keeping with his interpolation of an ecclesiastical enterprise in the Charter for the purpose of extending the Church

of England among the Indians, Mr. Oliver insists upon representing those "godly pastors" whom the exiles brought with them for their own edification as "missionaries." His readers are thus blinded to the truth as to the errand, the relations, and the contract made with these ministers, and might even infer that they were sent originally as stipendiaries of the English Church. He says, "They were required to minister to the savages." So, in precisely the same way, and in no other way, are the successors of those ministers required to serve the poor and neglected outside of their own congregations. Fortunately we have copies of the agreement made with those very men, specifying their service and its terms, just as such contracts do at the present day. Not a hint is given in the agreement, that these ministers were to strike off as missionaries into the woods. They were to remain in fixed dwellings, to be provided for them as the pastors of the exiles. Though the Bishop of London was constructively their spiritual overseer, they never applied to him for help; but they left the wilderness and its red wanderers free to the zeal which he might feel in their behalf. The English Church did afterwards send missionaries hither. But it was to settle among churches already provided with pastors, and not to go into the wilderness. And incidentally we may add, while referring to this agreement between the exiles and their pastors, that the facts of the case abate very much from the pertinency and smartness of a remark for which Roger Williams has been highly applauded. When questioned for withstanding the compulsory tax for the support of the ministers with the plain query, "Is not the laborer worthy of his hire?" "Yes," was his boasted reply, "from those that hire them." Now the difficulty is, the patentees *had hired* the ministers, and all occupants of land within their patent, who held by grant or sale from them, subjected themselves to all the contracts made by the Company. The seventh of the "General Considerations" advanced in England by Higginson of Salem to persuade to the enterprise, offers as a motive the raising and supporting of "a particular church" here.

We come now to the matter of the transfer of the Charter, which Mr. Oliver represents as a fraud of unrelieved turpi-

tude, knavery, and hypocrisy. We frankly admit that there is a cloud about it, yet not so dark by any means as he makes it. We wish we had more light on this point, not because we are ready to believe that Winthrop and his advisers require to have their characters cleared up, but because our curiosity is lively where it is especially mystified. This was the most emphatic incident or crisis in the old Colonial affairs of Massachusetts. The getting away from England with a Charter never intended for an ocean voyage, still less for a local residence and administration on another hemisphere, must at some stage of the proceedings have required adroit management. Whether the abettors of the movement, under their grim severity of aspect, had a sly consciousness that it was a sort of spoiling of the Egyptians, or a reprisal on the Philistines, it is impossible to say. They kept their own counsel well, at any rate; for not a line is known to be extant from their pens which betrays them as conscience-stricken, or as apprehensive of an arrest in their undertaking. Mr. Oliver would say, that they had taken good care that their secret should not transpire, and so felt safe, at least, awaiting discovery or security. Perhaps so, perhaps not. The affair, however, is in singular consistency with the whole train of events as subsequently developed, which culminated in the war of the Revolution. A curious inquirer, who should be zealously bent on indicating the first buddings of the full fair flower of Independence, would be compelled to trace it to a graft severed from a wild republican stock in Old England, and inserted upon a wilder and freer growth of our native forests. At what hour from the first settlement of the Bay Colony was not the spirit of those who guided its destiny virtually independent of control from the mother country? The design of leaving their home for good, and of identifying the remnant of their life and its toils with a foreign plantation, was the result in the minds of the patentees of long struggles and a deep-seated discontent in their own land. They were positively unhappy under the distractions and iniquities there prevailing. They foreboded even more disastrous times;—as the event proved, their forebodings were more than justified. The kindling ideal which burned within their

devout hearts presented itself to them in the form of a Christian commonwealth, planted by fair omens, and cherished with fostering piety, in the freedom of the wilderness. Here, in these feelings and purposes, we find the instigating motives which led them to seek a charter for their enterprise. Even saints, while they are in the body, must live on earthly food, and be clothed and sheltered. To secure these moderate supplies, and not to win wealth, was the sole ground for all such sublunary arrangements in their plan as have been seized upon for fixing on them the charge of a mercenary and a mercantile spirit.

The early Virginia Charter provided for two councils to administer the government of each of the two plantations: one council for each plantation was to exercise its functions in England, the other was invested with all necessary powers on the soil of the Colony. But all previous attempts at colonization, whether led by individual enterprise or patronized by huge monopoly companies, had failed. It was evident that, if such an enterprise was ever destined to succeed, it must be under other auspices, and especially by the aid of an authority administered with a high hand and a severe rule, on the very soil itself. The famous Captain John Smith — all whose unnumbered namesakes should thank him for having done so much to keep their vague appellation within the rule of grammar which distinguishes between *common* and *proper* names — had given words of warning, which, if we mistake not, were of controlling weight with the leaders of the Bay Colony. Within the year after their departure with their Charter, he published his "Advertisements for the Unexperienced Planters of New England." In this document he wrote what he must substantially have spoken years before to those who consulted his rich experience. He refers to the scandal, shame, and disgrace wrought in with the failure of all previous undertakings, and he holds up the Massachusetts Company to approval for their course, in which he finds full promise of success. He says: "They take not that course the Virginia Company did for the Planters there. Their purses and lives were subject to some few here in London, who were never there, that consumed all in arguments, projects, and their own conceits;

every yeare trying new conclusions, altering everything yearly as they altered opinions, till they had consumed more than two hundred thousand pounds, and neere eight thousand men's lives."

Under a grant from the Plymouth Council, confirmed by a Charter from the King, the Bay Company was incorporated in March, 1628. This Charter recognized a residentiary administration in England of all its pecuniary affairs, and of its official processes, and provided for a delegated administration in the plantation. The "Agreement" made and signed at Cambridge, England, by those purposing to come hither, requires, as a condition of their emigration, "that the Patent may be legally transferred and established to remain with us." At a meeting of the Court of the Company, held three days afterward, the question as to a transfer of the government to New England was put to vote, "soe as it may be done legally." The records say, it appeared to be "the general consent." They also "consulted counsel" on the subject. But on this we will not lay stress; for we neither assume nor defend the strict legality of the transfer. The best vindication of the act which we know of is to say, that it seemed to be in accordance with the leadings and the purposes of Providence. The "counsel" consulted was a man whose spirit and opinions were puritanical, and if the incipient rebels had really wished for adequate authority in the case, they would have gone to a higher source for advice. Not a hint, however, is dropped in the record of their debates, or in the pursuit of their subsequent plans, of their having feared a surprise as discovered culprits. In the month preceding their final vote, those members of the Company who were present at their Court were directed to set down with much care and deliberation the reasons for and against the transfer; "and in the meantime they are desired to carry this business secretly, that the same bee not divulged." Those who challenge the moral integrity of the proceeding must make the utmost of this sentence as indicating intrigue and an uneasy conscience. It is all they will find from the pen of any one concerned in it. Perhaps, too, the sentence covers merely a desire to keep their plans to themselves till they were matured, and to secure

themselves against malicious enemies and mercantile speculators.

But hither they came, bringing their Charter, which has never since crossed the ocean. If a British fleet should ever bombard this city and get possession, let their forces try to seize the venerable instrument, fairly written on its ample parchments. It would be the proudest trophy which Britain could carry from our shores; for it was the ringleader in all her American quarrels. Here, too, the patentees established a government, ay, a commonwealth; and they ruled with an iron sway, and with an unswerving and unrelenting loyalty to the laws, which they obeyed themselves after they had made them, and which they were resolved that all within their jurisdiction should obey. Mr. Oliver has an easy task in exposing the severity, the harshness, and the despotism of Puritan legislation, first in civil, then in spiritual matters. It is a task which many others, whose regard for the Puritans is much higher than his, have performed as faithfully, but more candidly, more considerately. He is entirely oblivious of all the parallelisms which English legislation at the same period affords of equally oppressive burdens upon conscience, property, and life.

"Fraud, violence, and cunning" were the vices, "enterprise, daring, and self-sacrifice" were the virtues, of the Puritans, according to Mr. Oliver's judgment of them. His severity is excessive; his concessions are not generous. He says that they changed the charter of a mercantile company into the constitution of a Puritan state. So far as this allegation is true, — and in great part it is true, — the legislative policy of the Puritans is to be vindicated either by the necessities of their position, or by the predilections which their English training had wrought in them, or by the risks of anarchy and ruin to which their enterprise and property would have been subjected, had they been slack instead of rigid in their course. The Charter provided for some sort of government among the agents and servants here, sent over by the Company. Would that government, provided for abroad, without exact knowledge of emergencies as they arose, and administered here by delegated authority, have had in it less of the ele-

ments of absolutism, and have been at the same time equally efficient for its ends? It is always to be remembered that the founders of Massachusetts were not only Puritans, and so far embryo republicans as well as anti-prelatists, but that they also had many of the stiff and dogged notions of Englishmen. They brought with them from home two essentially English prejudices, under which they had been reared, and from which they had personally suffered much; namely, a fixed belief in the necessity of an aristocratic prerogative in legislation,* and an unquestioned conviction that the civil power had a right to control the free exercise of religion. The blinding influence of these two obstinate English notions will go as far towards accounting for what was objectionable in their policy, as will an exposition or a caricature of their peculiar characteristics as Puritans. Mr. Oliver seems to be amazed that the passage of the ocean did not divest them of prejudices which entered then into the composition of all Englishmen, and which still characterize the prevailing institutions of that realm. He makes no allowance whatever for the unsettled and distracted state of affairs in their native land when they left it. The darkest apprehensions, the most appalling calamities, changing their form only to deepen in dismay and dread, were oppressing the hearts of the best men and women in the land. A perfidious king, whose tyranny and hypocrisy find fuller attestation as busy explorers from time to time bring to light the secret intrigues of those sad years, had forfeited his claim to the loyal love of his subjects. Ecclesiastical power exercised as oppressive a sway through the prelates and their iniquitous courts, as could have gone out from a Roman legate and an inquisition. From ill-governed England, her tyrant king, her persecuting Church,—persecuting not to uphold Christ's truth, but to sustain a shattered ceremonial and a simoniacal system,—the Puritans came hither to put to trial a system of their own,—to develop certainly the most origi-

* In their answer to proposals from certain "persons of quality" relative to an intended removal to New England, they say: "Two distinct ranks we willingly acknowledge, from the light of nature and Scripture: the one of them called Princes, or Nobles, or Elders (amongst whom gentlemen have their place); the other, the People."

nal and sublime conception which has ever formed the basis of a state. Whether their conception was purely one of fancy, impracticable and impossible considering that human nature is what it is, or whether the men who attempted to realize it were not wise or good enough to vindicate its operation, are questions which we do not open. The Puritans at any rate were led by a great idea, too great indeed for their full apprehension of it, and they were trying to work it out.

Their Charter did not provide for such a government as they established here. They had to construe it sometimes quite rigidly, sometimes quite loosely, and often to strain, interpolate, and supplement it, to make it serve as the nominal basis and the sufficient warrant of their legislative and judicial proceedings. There was a great deal of *extempore* legislation, called out by emergencies, connected with, and only to be explained by, circumstances of which we are not fully informed, and designed to avert risks or to guard against evils which came to them as warnings from the failure of every similar enterprise that had preceded theirs. Their historian, Hubbard, gives us with quaint force a good sentence on this point: "It being commonly found that men gotten from under the reins of government are but like cattle without a fence, which are thereby apt to run wild and grow unruly without good laws." No one of course, at the present day, even with a more tolerant and considerate spirit than Mr. Oliver brings to his work, can examine the legislative code of the Puritans, or follow the contest between the magistrates upheld by the elders, and the people at large, without finding many tokens of an arbitrary rule, as well as of a determination on the part of those in power to retain it, and of those who were only subject to it to gain a share of it. The Charter was violated from the first. The magistrates grasped an arbitrary power. The deputies of the people were right in pressing their demands. Our liberties and our noble institutions, the glory of our Commonwealth, were won at first by compromises with, then by assaults upon, and finally by a triumph over, the rigid rule of "magistrates and elders." All this is true. But does it tell solely to the discomfiture of Puritanism? By no means. Arbitrary power was not the outgrowth of Puritanism. That

old English idea of the absolute necessity of an aristocratic prerogative extended its influence over these wilderness legislators, as it did over their Parliament at home. Nor is it ever to be forgotten, that these hard-handed magistrates were the patentees of the Company, the responsible undertakers in the enterprise, whose property and worldly interests were all committed to it. With them came servants and supernumeraries, interlopers and fortune-hunters, and, from time to time, specimens of all the freaks of human nature in working itself up into every sort of strange, "exorbitant, unprofitable, and scandalous" character. The swarms of unsettled and obnoxious persons who followed the exiles from disaffected and revolutionary England had great influence in sowing here a wild radicalism. It was not always from pride or self-righteousness that the rulers stiffly asserted their prerogatives against "the common sort." The powers exercised by these magistrates, which, as Mr. Oliver says, the king had not committed to them, were the very powers which they did not believe that the king had any right to give, nor certainly any right to withhold. Cæsar and Tacitus both appear to have been struck with a peculiarity of the ancestors of our colonists, as a people *jealous of their liberties*. Upon these liberties, which first grew up in an old wilderness, the colonists fell back when they found themselves in a new wilderness. The contest for power between the magistrates and the people was in the main a struggle towards the working out and settling of untried principles. Were Mr. Oliver here to answer, we should be glad to put to him this question, — How much more tyrannical was the aim of the magistrates to retain their proprietary and legislative power above the freemen, than was the bold announcement of their own king that "he would call no more Parliaments"? Strangely, too, does Mr. Oliver wink out of sight the fact, that the freemen who finally broke the power of the magistrates were themselves also Puritans. He says: "We have shown that the Puritan Commonwealth was saved from absolute despotism only by the determined opposition of the freemen, and that the elders and magistrates were alike the enemies of popular freedom. The republican cast, into which the body politic was moulded, was forced upon it

by the freemen, *in spite* of the elders and magistrates." Of course, then, there was as much of the spirit of Puritanism in the popular resistance as in the patrician oppression. When these freemen thus obtained their rights, they imposed a fine on the magistrates. Yet it was these identical freemen who enacted the law excluding all but church-members from the franchise.

The laws of the Puritan Commonwealth, and the sentences inflicted under them in civil matters, have to us often a most arbitrary aspect. But the range which they cover, and the evident impartiality of their operation, give them for the most part a claim to our respect, as being conformed to the rigid rules of righteousness. Legislation then extended here and in Europe to matters which are now wholly omitted from our statute-books. If any one curious to gather such facts will run his eye over our recently published Court Records, we think the variety and the impartiality of the Puritan legislation will redeem its severity, in his fair judgment. It is a somewhat remarkable fact, that no class of the colonists, from the highest to the lowest, and scarce even a single individual in the higher ranks of magistrates or elders, escaped trial and sentence during the first fifty years of the settlement. There are all sorts of cases on those records, and all sorts of victims, from the Governor downward. Saltonstall, Endicott, Winthrop, Vane, Pynchon, yes, even "holy Mr. Cotton," had to plead as challenged-offenders. Magistrates were fined for not coming to Court, and one of them was fined for inflicting a deserved whipping without the presence of one of his colleagues. The careless firing of an Indian wigwam, the use of a man's tongue in reviling speeches, and of a woman's in inordinate scolding, drew down each its penalty. "Nich. Knopp is fyned £ 5 for takeing vpon him to cure the scurvey by a water of noe worth nor value, which he solde att a very deare rate, to be imprisoned till hee pay his ffine, or giue securitye for it, or els to bee whipped," &c. "Tho. Knower was sett in the bilbowes for threateing the Court, that, if hee should be punist, hee would haue it tried in England whither hee was lawfully punished or not." It would not have answered at all to allow a tongue like that to wag freely. Law-

yer Lechford, "of Clement's Inn, Gent.," found a four years' residence here enough for him, and though no admirer of our Commonwealth, he was yet so candid as to write in his "Plain Dealing," and to publish on his return home, the following sentence: "I think that wiser men than they, going into a wilderness to set up another strange government differing from the settled government here, might have fallen into greater errors than they have done." Triumphantly did the Court urge in proof of the wisdom of their legislation, — in replying to the seditious petition of Child, Maverick, and others, — "Let the petitioners produce any colonie or commonwealth in the world, where more hath been done in sixteen yeares."

Meanwhile, Mr. Oliver constantly reminds us that these sturdy Puritans seemed to forget their duty of allegiance to the king. Here we set up no defence. The charge is true. Very grudgingly and very coldly do the records recognize the existence of that august personage. The Puritans knew him better than did Mr. Oliver, and had less respect for him. As they wanted nothing from him, they well-nigh forgot him. We have no intention of following Mr. Oliver with a searching examination of his specific statements, often of unmitigated bitterness and severity, as he relates the protracted struggle of half a century about the Charter. Kings tried in vain to recall it. A royal commission headed by Archbishop Laud, and a Parliamentary commission, to say nothing of a *quo warranto* from the King's Bench, brought their arbitrary and their legal measures to bear on the same futile effort, — futile, that is, till the commonwealth had planted itself on safe foundations. The Great Council of Plymouth, being called to account for the rebellious conduct of those whose charter was derived from them, surrendered their patent, and pleaded innocence of all trespass. But we have our Charter. We grant that nothing but the distracted state of England enabled our fathers to hold their ground. We grant that there was a good deal of sly management, and adroit intrigue, and original Yankee ingenuity exercised in the necessary playing fast and loose in those times. But the paramount necessity was to hold on to the Charter. It would have been a fatal and a suicidal act to surrender it too soon. As cogently as shrewdly

did our fathers return in answer to the demand for its transmission from the Lords Commissioners, that if they gave it up they would "be looked upon as runnigadoes and outlawed." A sly hint that they might also be compelled to put themselves under another government, and a further suggestion as to the sort of government likely to be "set up" here if the Charter was vacated, seemed admirably suited to the emergency. Now let the curious reader peruse the royal instrument defining the powers of the Commission headed by that hated prelate, Archbishop Laud, and ask what would have been gained if the outrageous, tyrannical, and arbitrary powers which that conferred, had been substituted here for the institutions of the Puritan Commonwealth. When at a later date that pestilent Andros bearded the Court, they found grace to tell him that they held their lands "by the grand charter of God."

But more especially does Mr. Oliver's zeal kindle while he traces the development of the Puritan Church. He draws out at length the story of the strifes and alienations which attended it. He tells us of its chaotic theology leading to incessant schisms, of its heresies about communion and baptism, resulting in the growth of a pagan generation, and in the exclusion of five sixths of the population from Christian ordinances. He tries hard to discredit with us the right of private judgment, and he gives us an essay on the apostolical character, origin, and authority of the Church of England. He has far more of fact than we wish he had to turn to his account in proof of the severe and bigoted character of the system which was here put on trial. We grant that the scheme was an impracticable one, and that the attempt to set it up involved injustice, cruelty, and failure. But we part company with him when he charges malice and hypocrisy on the elders and magistrates. They were as sincere and honest men as ever lived. Mr. Oliver begins by copying at length that beautiful farewell address, as breathed in the name of the exiles when they were leaving English waters, to their brethren in and of the Church of England. It is a sweet and affectionate parting outburst of yearning and struggling hearts. Mr. Oliver is horrified that those who could utter such kindly

words and prayers, as in communion with the Church of England, could so soon prove disloyal to its anointed king, and spitefully hostile to its order, its ritual, its authority, and its members. But he is inconsiderate here as elsewhere. That "Humble Request" was probably written by White of Dorchester, himself not one of the exiles. Though it did speak for all who signed it, the circumstances connected with it will not allow us to regard it as a profession on the part of all the company of a love for those distinctive features of the Church which caused them so soon to forego her communion. Why, indeed, may we not fairly interpret the document as referring rather in general to the whole Reformed Church of England? But they were schismatics as soon as they touched foreign soil. Yes, and so they were, virtually, when they left their own soil. Of all the centuries of recorded English history, that was the time when wise and good men were most anxious to leave the realm, and when no other motive could induce such men to remain than the motive of trying to help their country through the dark waves which were breaking upon it. Those who left England then were least likely to take with them any ardent love for royalty or a hierarchy.

How were the Puritans to transplant to a wilderness soil a system based on the English ecclesiastical and parochial system, with its traditionary usages, its tithes, advowsons, and inductions? Mr. Oliver seems to have forgotten that the gray churches of his ancestral land were but spoils of another creed and ritual. It is not by an ecclesiastical transmission, but by a Parliamentary statute, that the English Church holds every cathedral in the realm, with the exception of St. Paul's in London, every parish church built before the time of Elizabeth, and innumerable endowed schools and charities. The intruder Randolph, whom Mr. Oliver highly applauds, proposed to assess the support of his Episcopal minister upon the three Congregational churches in Boston. The silly story that even Roman Catholic Maryland gave Massachusetts an example of free toleration, is disallowed now by her recent Catholic historians, De Courcy and Shea. Our historian Hubbard very pertinently says of our fathers at their coming, that "they had not as yet waded so far into the controversy of

church discipline as to be very positive in any of those points wherein the main hinge of the controversy lay between them and others." He adds, that their aim was to follow the Scripture ideal in their church method, and "if they have missed of their aim, they are not to be blamed for levelling at the right mark." It was the personal influence of Cotton and Hooker, and a literal construction and reapplication of Scripture texts and authorities, that moulded their system.

In Winthrop's Reply to Vane's Answer to his Defence of an Order of Court, 1637, forbidding habitation without allowance of the magistrates, occurs a most remarkable sentence, giving us the key to the singular ecclesiastical policy of the Puritans. The sentence would appear to have been incidentally written, but it is of emphatic importance. "Whereas the way of God hath alwayes beene to gather his churches out of the world, now the world, or civill state, must be raised out of the churches." This explains everything to us in the religious institutions of our ancestors. The English Magna Charta restricted the right of suffrage in the choice of their own representatives in the Commons to *freeholders*. Puritanism restricted the right of suffrage to *Christians*. It tried to evolve a state out of a church. There have been many more fanciful, many less inspiring aims than this, proposed in the great schemes of men. Mr. Oliver misses the point of truth when he says, "The principle was asserted, that the people were the source of spiritual, before it was even dreamed that they were of political authority." It was not "the people," but the Scriptures, which had overruling sway here. Again, Mr. Oliver, in one of his most bitter passages, speaks of the Congregational *pulpit* as "a democratic toy," when "not sheltered by the altar," and in danger of becoming "the stand of an auctioneer, or the throne of a caucus." But when is it not thus sheltered? Has not the English pulpit been often a burrow for stupidity, laziness, and impiety? Our risks of that sort are slight compared with those of an Establishment.

Except for the sake of a systematic treatment of the parts of his fruitful subject, it was hardly necessary for Mr. Oliver to devote a distinct division of his work to "the intolerant spirit of the Puritan Church." The facts and inci-

dents which come under relation on this head, though abundant and most significant, are substantially of the same character, and are to be referred to the same fundamental principles for their explanation, with any other class of particulars that entered into the policy of Massachusetts Puritanism. Be it again remembered, that the court before which these stern and consistent opposers of toleration are to be tried, is not a court recognizing the principles of the nineteenth century. Rich and tempting are the materials furnished by the pens of our fathers, from which their children may draw high lessons of saddened wisdom upon the exalted theme of religious liberty. Whether those old records,—so frank in the statement of painful and deplorable facts, bearing such evidence of sincerity in the doing of the very deeds which we now pronounce the most disgraceful, and never entering into apology or plea of self-justification,—whether those records are turned to the best uses of wisdom and charity in the method pursued by Mr. Oliver, is a question to be decided solely by the spirit of the reader. No descendant of the Puritans would now undertake to vindicate either the policy or the righteousness of their intolerant proceedings in church or state. But there is no good end to be answered by an embittered or a sarcastic rehearsal of the melancholy strifes through which they learned the precious wisdom, not a single lesson of whose treasured counsels has been ratified to the world otherwise than at a fearful cost to brain and body, heart and spirit. An appreciative and grateful sentiment, caught from a survey of the fruits of all such conflicts, will cast back upon them a softening and forgiving tone, even when stern epithets must be used in relating them. During the first fifty years of Puritan rule on this soil, there were outrages committed in the name of law, and with the sanction of religion, which it would be folly now to attempt to palliate. We think it no less foolish to lavish invectives upon them. The faithful historian will always be pained at the necessity of renewing the record of them; but he will be sure of this, that the more closely he keeps to the exact truth in detail and specification, the better will the case stand for those whom it is his object to set forth in the light of their own true purposes as in conflict with the prevailing

darkness of their time. Mr. Oliver himself reminds us, though with a taunt, that "they did not sacrifice their comfortable [?] livings in England for the purpose of acknowledging fellowship with separatists, or of sharing their newly-acquired spoils with churchmen." No, they did not. The honored Winthrop wrote to better purpose. "All amounts to this summe, the Lord hath brought us hither, through the swelling seas, through perills of pyrates, tempests, leaks, fires, rocks, sands, diseases, starvings, and hath here preserved us these many yeares, from the displeasure of princes, the envy and rage of prelates, the malignant plots of Jesuits, the mutinous contentions of discontented persons, the open and secret attempts of barbarous Indians, the seditions and undermining practices of hereticall false brethren." * Truly here is a grievous list of troubles and trials.

Now we have to allege against Mr. Oliver, in the treatment of this as of each of the other divisions of his subject, an error which warped his own judgment, and has led to a perversion of the truth of history by his pen. We will not question in detail the accuracy of his statements in exhibiting the intolerance of the Massachusetts rulers and elders. Though he uses the utmost sharpness of severity and invective in heightening his censures upon the persecutors, and though he softens by epithets of commiseration and patronizing apologies the conduct and course of their victims, his facts are facts. But he misrepresents the leading motive and purpose of the exiles in coming hither, and he deprives them of the benefit of an explanation which essentially relieves the intolerance of their proceedings, as against certain individuals and within certain limits. Mr. Oliver's erroneous bias on this part of his subject comes from his misapprehension of the idea, the purpose, which prompted the planting of the Bay Colony. He says, "It was the so-called intolerance of the English Church which led to the establishment of sectarianism in the New World." Then he asks if the exiles were consistent with their purpose, if they showed their consistency and sincerity by raising a purer altar in the wilderness. He admits that they

* Answer to the Ipswich Letter, in the Hutchinson Papers.

did not come to avoid persecution; for they might have hoped to become the persecuting party at home. The plea set up for them, says Mr. Oliver, is, that they did not like to conform to superstitions and ceremonies, and sought the right to think and worship as they pleased. "Alas for the infirmity of human purpose! There was some color for the proceedings of the courts of the Star-Chamber and High Commission. These were at least performing a great and important duty to the church and state. Both prescriptive and statute laws required the unqualified obedience of the subject. It was not the fact, but the manner of presenting the fact, that rendered these high tribunals odious. But what plea could Puritanism offer in defence of persecution?" Passing unchallenged this dismal plea in behalf of those atrocious spiritual courts of England,—only asking the reader to mark the plea as indicating very significantly the mind of the writer as the defender of prelatical tyranny,—we come to a more important point. Mr. Oliver has misstated the fundamental idea, the leading purpose, of the exiles. They did not come hither for toleration. They did not believe in toleration. Not a line can be quoted from the pen of any one of them, which admits the wisdom or the abstract right of toleration. On the contrary, they spurned it, they used the utmost sharpness of rebuke and disclaimer whenever they spoke of it. At the close of a quarter of a century after the settlement of the Plymouth Colony, one of its magistrates did indeed move in its Court for a general toleration. The gentle Winslow wrote to the gentle Winthrop, "You would have admired to have seen how sweet this carrion relished to the palate of most of the deputies." But the Plymouth Governor refused even to put the motion to vote, "as being that, indeed, which would eat out the power of godliness."

But, it will be insisted, the leaders of the Bay Colony aimed at least to secure toleration for themselves, for their own consciences, including their whims and scruples. No, we answer. The spirit which drove them was not so secular or selfish as that. They did not look for toleration from one another, they would not tolerate one another, except in subordination to a higher and nobler ideal, from the pursuit of which they derived

the whole impulse and inspiration of their work. Their positive, unselfish, and entirely ideal aim was to establish a Christian commonwealth in the wilderness, and to make themselves the subjects of it. They did not care to weigh the cost nor to estimate the endurance required, if so be they could realize that ideal. They expected to be taxed, to be fettered, to be trammelled, and to be ruled by a more rigid and exacting code than had ever before been imposed upon any race or society of men. They knew the terms and the constitution of the old Jewish theocracy, how burdensome and oppressive was its yoke, how omnipresent in house, temple, and field was its ritual sway, and how it ruled the liberty of the freemen of a divine kingdom with an iron sceptre, whose unrelenting rigor would have been called tyranny if it had not been in the hand of God. The Puritan conceived of a new theocracy in the wilderness, which should receive its statute law from the Gospel, while its common law rested upon the older revelation. Not for a more relaxed and easier submission, softened by the milder spirit of the Gospel, but for even a severer and more constraining subjection to a rule established in his will and in his thoughts, did the citizen of this new Christian commonwealth go forth with his little band into the wilderness. The Puritan believed that a holy nation might grow out of a pure church. He was bent on trying the experiment of subjecting his citizenship to a Gospel rule, and it seemed to him but a fair condition for the recognition of the right of fellow-citizenship in another, that he should give in his allegiance to Christ. We may say or think what we will of this ideal conception which floated before the believing vision of the Puritan. We may call it a chimera, or a sublime fancy, or an aim reasonable in itself, yet impracticable because of temporary or permanent obstacles in the way of its fulfilment. But we cannot do justice to the intent, we certainly cannot give a fair account of the "intolerance," of the Puritans, and, what is more than either of these things, we cannot explain the process by which our own noble institutions have been developed from Puritanism, without recognizing their leading and paramount aim in coming hither. It was not to escape fines and prisons, it was not to find a safe shelter for their own

freedom of thought and worship. They came to the wilderness to set up a Christian commonwealth, to establish a civil, social, and political order conformed to the Gospel, the citizens of which should be saints. They did not come to rid themselves of a tyrant on an earthly throne, but to subject themselves in allegiance to a Divine King. To every burden which they laid upon others they had bowed their own shoulders. They transferred their loyalty to Heaven.

The easy sentence of condemnation passed upon these exiled Puritans by some of their lighter critics, suggests that their own sufferings by persecution at home should have effectually secured them against the practice of it here. The lessons that are taught only in the passage of centuries cannot thus be forestalled by the transit over an ocean. The experience of the Puritans at home worked in fact toward a result directly opposite to that which this shallow criticism indicates for it. The English Church had trained the Puritans in the practice of persecution for opinion, and they brought the fruits of their training hither. Instead of having learned from their own perils and sufferings that intolerance was foolish and unjust, they had been made to believe that perfect tolerance was unsafe and ruinous. The whole effect of their religious nurture in England had prevailed to fix in them a conviction that religion could not and ought not to be left free from all oversight of human law. They had been taught that perfect liberty was not allowable, that persecution for opinion was allowable. They never disputed the truth of these assumptions, even when suffering under them; they but maintained that the liberty which *they* exercised was safe, and that *their own* suffering by persecution was unjust. The lesson that abstract liberty in opinion and worship must be restrained, had been indelibly stamped in their convictions by their own severe experience from it. The freest air of the wilderness could not at once dispel the effect of the vapors from their prison-life at home.

What can be more preposterous, what more false to history, than the following assertions advanced by Mr. Oliver? "The question whether the civil magistrate may lawfully punish for heresy, first [!] arose when Calvin burnt Servetus. Beza, the

associate of Calvin, maintained the affirmative ; and the English exiles, who fled their country in dread of the persecuting Mary, learned from the master-spirits of the Reformation that the axe and fagot are lawful arguments in spiritual controversies. They carried these notions back to England, and from England they were brought to the New World." Passing by the reckless partisanship of this trifling with truth, — in which Mr. Oliver witlessly confounds himself by connecting the epithet *persecuting* with Mary, unless he means to represent her as a Puritan, — we find a very significant sentence on the next page. Our author, uttering a taunt, indorses the very truth which we have been pressing, in asserting that the Puritan had learned from his own mother Church that perfect tolerance was not allowable. He says : " His own vagaries had not been suffered in the land of his birth ; was he to tolerate the vagaries of others in the land of his choice, in the home of his liberty ? " No ! we answer. It would have been expecting too much of the victims of the Star-Chamber and the High Commission to suppose that suffering for opinion's sake would make them tolerant of any notion, doctrine, or practice for which they could not find warrant in the Bible. After his unsparing detail of every case of severity here against heresy, Mr. Oliver says : " There were no laws in England for hanging or mutilating or flogging the king's subjects, because they did not profess the Puritan faith." Very true. The laws operated just the other way. The hangings, mutilatings, and floggings were for those who *did* profess the Puritan faith ; the burnings, disembowellings, and quarterings, being confined to the land of their origin, among the former fellow-subjects of the Puritans, were never practised here.

With this training in the supposed necessity of violent means for repressing vagaries and heresies of religious opinion and practice, and guided by the vision of a Christian commonwealth to be established here, the Puritans began their wilderness work. Mr. Oliver, by his silence on a very important point, and the blinding stress which he lays on some other very subsidiary facts, deprives these exiles of the benefit of what they would have advanced as their main justification for their treatment of heretics. They acted under the persua-

sion that they had the absolute and exclusive ownership of the soil within the limits of their charter, saving only the rights of the red-men. From the moment in which they took possession, they had full power to keep out all whom they did not wish to have near them. Of this power they were entirely conscious. They were well aware what a degree of security it gave them, and it will be found that, in all their proceedings against obnoxious persons, they limited the sentence of banishment to the external bounds of the jurisdiction, and to that extent they exercised their prerogative with a confidence that no authority on the earth could question it. In all the previous attempts at colonization, the enterprise of the most patient and faithful had been defrauded of its reward by the disaffection or malice of individuals, generally such as filled subordinate positions. These disaffected persons would either remain to breed discord, or go home to England bearing ill-reports or scandals. The Massachusetts Company had had experience of such enemies, and knew how they had perilled or withstood the success of former undertakings. Probably we have no means of estimating the amount of mischief actually suffered from this cause, or the anxiety and apprehension which it brought with it for those who embarked their all of substance and of heart in these enterprises. In the original Plymouth Council Charter we find an emphatic reference to the case of mutinous and misbehaving persons as a possible source of harm to the projected colony. It was provided, that if any such offenders, after causing trouble in the plantation, should steal away, or be sent back to England, and should there "by insolent and contemptuous carriage divulge vile and scandalous reports of the country of New England, or of the government or estate of the said plantation or colony, to bring the said voyages and plantation into disgrace and contempt," they should be summarily dealt with by the Council of the Company in England, or else be remanded to New England, "to be proceeded against and punished" by the authorities here.

The Massachusetts Charter likewise granted full power to the Governor and Company "to encounter, expulse, repell, and resist by force of Armes, all such person and persons as

shall at any time hereafter attempt or enterprise the destruction, invasion, detriment, or *annoyance* to the said plantation or inhabitants." The adventurers in this enterprise embarked their substance while they threw their zeal into the undertaking. All that came under the auspices of Winthrop and the Charter were either shareholders or their servants. The servants were subject by written contract to those who assumed the cost and risk of the enterprise. Now Mr. Oliver and other severe assailants of the Puritan leaders seem to wink all these facts out of sight, and to take for granted that the colonists opened here a free asylum for all sorts of vagabonds and fortune-hunters, somewhat like that which Romulus offered in his marauding citadel. The religious restriction upon the franchise is looked at by such censorious judges as simply an unrighteous denial of the rights of citizens. But it is to be remembered that a vote in any of the affairs of the Colony was a vote touching the security, the use, and the improvement of the private property and the corporate interests committed to it. By what rule of reason or of equity could the patentees have been held bound to allow to any chance comer among them the privilege of interfering in their affairs? They believed that their proprietary powers were absolute, that within the limits of their patent they could exercise an unfettered jurisdiction, and that they could fix the terms upon which they would receive new partners. A voter became a partner in territorial and proprietary rights. If the colonists had desired to live in social fellowship with all sorts of persons, holding all sorts of opinions, they would doubtless have remained at home; for about the time of their emigration England afforded a rare and rich variety of heretics and heresies. Their aim in leaving England was to get rid of certain things and persons, and their aim here was to keep rid of them. In nearly every case, the disturbers of their peace and the victims of their intolerance were offered the opportunity of leaving the jurisdiction unharmed. The land that lay within their bounds was theirs, — they would allow no nuisances here; there was no lack of space on the continent to harbor all intruders and malecontents: such could not stay here, — they might go where they pleased, provided they would

go off. One Philip Ratcliff, a servant of Governor Cradock, "spake boldly and wickedly against the government and governors here." He was whipped, and had his ears cut off. It was a barbarous punishment; but it was the same that Mr. Oliver's amiable Star-Chamber court, by the sentence of "that holy martyr, Archbishop Laud," visited upon Messrs. Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick. Poor Mr. Prynne was the victim of this sentence a second time, and so it was provided, that, having already lost his ears, "the remainder of his stumps should be cut off." Besse's "Sufferings of the Quakers" covers cases of outrage and violence on both sides of the ocean. Let Mr. Oliver's readers remember that Baxter and Bunyan were tried in England, not here.

A zealous champion of the stern magistrates and elders of Massachusetts might not shrink from the task of following the lead of Mr. Oliver in his detail of all their severities against heretics, with the purpose of clearing some of the darkness of the record. We attempt nothing of the kind. We have no palliation to offer, no plea to set up for their justification. Knowing how hard we ourselves should have fared at their hands, we discharge ourselves of the duty of their championship. And it is simply for the reason that we cannot justify them by our principles, that we insist upon their right to be judged by their own principles. With due commiseration for all the sufferers by their intolerance, we must remember that they never went out of their way nor out of their bounds to inflict it. Their victims came to them, and provoked punishment by their obstinacy, or offered stoutly to meet the consequences of their heresy, — with the single exception of the followers of Mrs. Hutchinson, and then the issue was a strife between parties nearly equal in strength, and fully equal in mutual intolerance. We cannot, with Mr. Oliver, single out the fathers of Massachusetts for especial condemnation as persecutors, nor can we emphasize their intolerance as standing forth in peculiarly dark colors upon the pages of ecclesiastical history, which has the same sad tale to tell of every age and every party in the Christian Church. When Mr. Oliver's friend, Mr. Randolph, set up his commission here, he commenced the same practice of intolerance.

To one who can yield to the more genial spirit which kindles over the fantastic and humorous points presented here and there in an otherwise most sombre record, there is material for pleasanter meditation even on this theme. There is something almost provocative of smiles in looking upon all the annoying, irritating, and vexatious discipline to which a most motley succession of heretics subjected those grim elders and magistrates. They seemed to be the mark and butt for all sorts of exorbitant and teasing men and women. Look at the matter as a trial of wits, an arraying of notions and scruples and extravagances often very equally matched against each other, and as an ingeniously devised and most effective process for working out some of the problems as to the fertility and the safety of free speculation. The poor Puritans were set upon by a series of the most provoking tormentors. The very gates of Pandemonium seem to have been opened upon them. Had they remained at home, they could hardly have encountered, by seeking after them, such a rare assortment of vagaries and offensive tenets as came to force themselves upon their notice in their wilderness retreat. Every headland in the Bay they found on their coming to be occupied by some mysterious and unaccountable characters, afterwards spoken of as a class by the designation of "the old planters." Each of these lonely residents had an old-world history behind him. How they came here, and when, and why, were of course matters of exceeding interest, as well as of misgiving and suspicion to the band of adventurers. Every one of them had to be "dealt with" sooner or later. Walford, the smith, with his wife, who resided at Charlestown, and who tinkered up arms for the Indians; Maverick, the man of pleasure, and "the only hospitable man in the Bay," of whose treatment of "the negro wench who had been a queen in Africa" we have so sad, though quaintly told, a tale; Blackstone, who rode over the otherwise tenantless peninsula of Boston "on a tame bull," — were all of them characters to exercise the curiosity and the patience of the Puritans. Thomas Morton, with his scandalous May-pole and other wild doings on his "Merry Mount," and Sir Christopher Gardiner, "an ecclesiastical person under Popish orders," and that pretty female cousin

of his, with whom he was suspected of living "after the Italian method," soon found a resolute hand laid upon them. Roger Williams, "the conscientious contentious person," having "a windmill in his head"; Samuel Gorton, that wild forerunner of our modern transcendentalists, who had a vast deal of method in his madness; Ann Hutchinson, with "her nimble tongue" and her odious enlistment of the "good wives" of the country in the sharp debates of unintelligible controversy,—succeeded one another just rapidly enough to prove to the Puritans how many angles there were in the problem they had undertaken to solve. What a rich and manifold experience it was! Scruples of conscience, and transcendental mystifications, and all sorts of premature intuitions, seem to have been called into being then for the special purpose of trying the tempers of our poor elders and magistrates. As soon as they had escorted a heretic out of the jurisdiction, he tried to pick up a companion, and, failing in that, faced about and got back here as soon as his conductors. As soon as one heresy was disposed of, another a little more exorbitant turned up in its place. They furnished our fathers the horn-books and the birch rods for whipping into full-grown pupils the master science of toleration. And the Puritans learned the lesson. Yes, they learned it thoroughly in the only way in which it could be taught or learned. The tuition was as difficult as would be the study of entomology beneath the full sun of the tropics, when all manner of gnats, sand-flies, centipedes, and other vermin, were strugglingly intruding themselves upon notice, and asking to have their species classified. When Mrs. Hutchinson was "convented" for heresy, Rev. Zechariah Symmes testified as a fellow-passenger with her hither a few years before, that he heard her "broach her revelations" then. Those long passages with their discussions and dreams, a constant reading of the Old Testament, the wilderness solitude, and free converse about all the shapings of mysteries and realities, were marvellous generators of heretical stuff. As soon as the material was out of the loom, sometimes before, it was brought to the notice of the men of Massachusetts, who were the constituted triers of such products, as they have since been the manufac-

turers of them for this whole continent. The Dutchmen at Manhattan, the rollicking Cavaliers in Virginia, never undertook such offices, and never were solicited to do so. Massachusetts set up for the business, and had enough of it. Mr. Oliver reads the history, finding one moral in it; we read it, finding another. The fires are out of those ashes of ancient strife, and their heat is cooled. We will grieve over the pages where we cannot help it; but we are determined at times to have our quiet smile over them. We think the heretics and their persecutors were often well matched in drawn games. What is the need of using vinegar for writing about those times now?

We have not space to reckon with Mr. Oliver at any length for his most perverse and embittered way of representing the course of the founders of Massachusetts towards the Indians. So grossly unjust is he in this part of his work, that cautious readers will find a spirit in his pages which will warn them against accepting his statements. It is indeed a sad record, even when most strictly conformed to truth, and relieved by every possible suggestion that will explain its darkest incidents and soften its most painful details. We do not undertake to show that our fathers behaved like wise, humane, and Christian persons toward the natives of this soil; for we are persuaded that they did not. And here again, as we cannot vindicate them by our principles, we must insist upon their being judged by their own. The melancholy story is too complicated to be despatched as it is by Mr. Oliver. He is not content with severity, but has recourse to misrepresentation. By quoting from Puritan writers disconnected lines, half-lines, or phrases, he appears to convict them of the most drivelling cant and of the blankest hypocrisy, as well as of the basest treachery in regard to their own treaties. If Mr. Oliver had read one tenth part of the voluminous publications printed either here or in England for the sake of exciting or of displaying the results of a Christian and humane zeal in the work of converting the Indians, he could not but have stood self-convicted by the thought that he was wronging the dead of his own lineage while pleading for the poor barbarians. There is proof, however, that he had read enough to know

that the Puritans did try devotedly and arduously, though not wisely, to be the means of civilizing and converting the savages. They engaged in the work, blindly perhaps, but earnestly and heroically, at the cost of much self-sacrifice. And they deserve the more credit for this, because of their superstitious notions and their English pride, which greatly embarrassed their measures. The savages were to them a mysterious race, unaccounted for, but of a most dark and suspicious generation. Some few of the Puritans tried to regard them as descended from a remnant of the lost tribes of Israel; but more were inclined to view them as lineal heirs and servants of the kingdom of the Evil One. Their barbarous names seemed to befit only a generation of imps and infernals. Hubbard says, that, when the Indians made their first overtures of friendship, the planters hardly knew whether to refuse or to accept, "not much unlike them who hold a wolf by the ears." The Puritans got the dark natives with their devil-worship mixed up in their minds, in some unaccountable way, with the vials and the plagues in the Apocalypse. Lechford says that none were sent out by any church to learn the natives' language, or to instruct them in religion: "First, because they say they have not to do with them without, unlesse they come to heare and learn English. Secondly, some say out of *Revela. 15. last*, it is not probable that any nation more can be converted, til the calling of the Jews: til the seven plagues are finished, and the seventh vial," &c.

The treaties made with these dreaded neighbors were but discreditable specimens of the science of diplomacy. Fear, policy, and perhaps cunning, influenced both parties to them, equally. That our fathers were intentionally treacherous towards the Indians in any instance, we cannot admit. The intrigues and rivalries in which the natives were constantly engaged with one another in tribes and parties, their mutual jealousies, and their sudden freaks, occasioned incessant alarm to the settlers, and at the same time made it impossible to hold peaceful relations with all of them. When the dread of midnight burnings and of the fiendish war-whoop passed through the straggling habitations of the whites, it was difficult for them to philosophize as Mr. Oliver does. While

men, women, and children, cowering in their pallets, were trying to distinguish the howl of the wolf from the screech of the human tiger, Mr. Oliver refers their fear to "guilty apprehensions," because in their dealings with the Indians they had proved recreant to all the claims of humanity and integrity. He tells us that that "master-spirit, King Philip" of Mount Hope, in his revenge, after exciting the red-men to arms from the Atlantic to the Hudson, destroyed twelve towns and greatly injured many more, slew six hundred of the very flower of the country, embracing members of every family in New England, and caused a loss of nearly a million of dollars. True. But is it strange that the Puritans feared all this beforehand from men who proved themselves able to accomplish it? In fifty years, says our author, the Puritans "swept from New England one hundred thousand human beings." But why should he have added to that appalling statement the following assertion, to which we will attach no epithet, though it deserves the worst: "For these unhappy heathen souls, no Puritan historian, magistrate, or elder, then or since, has expressed a word of pity, or breathed a penitential prayer"? Our author even complains that "the coloring of romance, which might so easily have been given to the Indian wars, and which would have served to disguise, partially at least, their amazing atrocity, is not to be found on the pages of the stern annalists of Plymouth or Massachusetts." True, again. We have observed that those who have had to meet the realities of barbarian massacres are generally quite neglectful of the romance that may be in them. That element they leave for subsequent writers. The author ungenerously conceals the painful efforts made to confine many young sons of the forest to the irksome tasks of the school-room and College at Cambridge, only one of whom escaped the fangs of consumption long enough to take a degree. He makes but an ungracious acknowledgment of the heroic consecration of Eliot and the Mayhews to their toils, while he says nothing about a host of their contemporaries and successors who labored till hope died in a most thankless undertaking. Yet he can write most gracefully and lovingly of the Jesuit missionaries, as they scoured the wilderness, bearing with them a doll dressed in

flaring bright calico petticoats as the Virgin Mary, and occasionally exciting their wild converts to sack and burn our border settlements. Most gingerly, too, can he write about the utter failure of the efforts of the Virginia Company, "proceeding on wrong, yet generous principles." He accounts for "the failure of the Anglican Church" missions in a way which we have not time to criticise.

But we must find a close. Yet we must not omit a reference to the most original and startling of all the incidental contents of Mr. Oliver's volume. If the assertion we are about to quote from him were only true, it would indeed carry with it a mortal stab at the hearts of many of our Fourth of July orators. The assertion is even this, that the rulers of Massachusetts in 1643 admitted that they were represented in the British Parliament by the knights and burgesses of the royal manor of East Greenwich, whence the tenure of their patent derived certain immunities from all feudal exactions. Yes, these rebels in the grain when they left England, these fathers of fully developed rebels,—who from the beginning omitted the King's name and inserted their own higher authority in their writs and other legal processes, who were slow to proclaim any new succession to the English throne, who bearded the commissioners of King and Parliament, who coined their own money in their own mint, and who sheltered hunted regicides,—these ever unloyal exiles, the date of whose first real declaration of independence it is utterly impossible to fix,—acknowledged that they had *bona fide* representatives among the Commons of England! Mr. Oliver is positive, and he reiterates his assertion. The reader who is curious to know what ground he has for this startling novelty must consult Winthrop (II. 182), and find it in a sly and guarded suggestion, dropped in a meeting of magistrates and elders, for the sake of getting round a weather-point.

We will part from the book before us in good temper. The author reluctantly tells us, that if good King Charles—whose pious missionary zeal our fathers so hypocritically imposed upon—"could have looked further into futurity, and beheld the rising England of the New World perpetuating the glories

of the mother country, doubtless the pious monarch would have furthered the schemes of the uneasy Puritans, and rendered their secret intrigues unnecessary." We fear they would have dreaded his furtherance more than they did his opposition. He admits that "the institutions" developed from Massachusetts Puritanism "have made the wilderness to blossom as the rose." His intimation, however, is, that these institutions sprang from the discomfiture of Puritanism. Still they were reared without the slightest help, except in the way of warning, from the two principles which Mr. Oliver most adores, — Monarchy and Prelacy. England's first rebel colony has reflected back upon the mother country more honor than all her loyal colonies.

ART. VIII. — *Annals of the American Pulpit; or Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of Various Denominations, from the Early Settlement of the Country to the Close of the Year Eighteen Hundred and Fifty-Five. With Historical Introductions.* By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Vols. I. and II. *Trinitarian Congregationalists*, New York: Robert Carter and Brothers. 8vo. pp. 723, 778.

WE wish the poet had put the same thought into a statelier or more eloquent form than the perpetually quoted line,

"The proper study of mankind is man."

It tells a truth which needs repeating so often, that no one phrase, unless very nicely worded, can safely sustain the reiteration. Such a royal text-book as a *Lexicon of Biographical Annals* supplies for this study, can of course accept so readily no less comprehensive sentiment as a just introduction to public notice.

Man, even taken miscellaneously and without classification, claims and rewards study as no other subject but his Creator can. But man, perused in historic developments, in his gen-